

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the first Official Action on a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) of the present application. Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for taking the time to conduct a telephone interview regarding the first Official Action. The first Official Action of this RCE rejects Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 19, 21, 22, 25, 26 and 28-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over PCT Application No. WO 99/56431 to Hansen et al., in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,839,339 to Chuah. The Official Action then rejects the remaining claims, namely Claims 6, 13, 20 and 27, as being unpatentable over Hansen in view of Chuah, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,438,123 to Chapman.

In response, and as proposed to the Examiner in connection with the aforementioned interview, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 8, 15 and 22 to include features substantially similar to those of respective ones of Claims 4, 11, 18 and 25; and accordingly, Claims 4, 11, 18 and 25 have been cancelled. In addition, Applicants have made a number of other minor amendments to Claims 22, 27 and 29-32 to further clarify the claimed invention. As explained below, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is patentably distinct from Hansen, Chuah and Chapman, taken individually or in any proper combination. In view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks presented herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims of the present application.

A. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 19, 21, 22, 25, 26 and 28-31 are Patentable

Amended independent Claim 1 generally recites a method of requesting a resource with reduced overhead including association of header field(s) with a group header identifier, and as amended, the method further includes replacing one or more fields associated with the group header identifier with one or more alternative fields. As explained during the telephone interview, none of Hansen, Chuah or Chapman, taken individually or in any proper combination, teach or suggest this replacement of header fields. That is, none of Hansen, Chuah or Chapman, taken individually or in any proper combination, teach or suggest receiving a subsequent request

including the group header identifier and alternative header field(s), and replacing the header field(s) associated with the group header identifier to thereby associate the alternative header field(s) with the group header identifier, as recited by amended independent Claim 1.

Addressing former dependent Claim 4, the Official Action concedes that at least Hanson does not teach or suggest the aforementioned feature, the Official Action instead asserting that Chuah discloses the feature. Relative to the RTP compression of Chuah cited for disclosing the feature, however, Chuah at best discloses altering the values of fields of a RTP header, and not altering the fields themselves, similar to amended independent Claim 1. In this regard, Chuah discloses a communication session in which parties to the session maintain shared information defining the session context, where the shared information includes a full RTP header. For the session, then, communication may include a compressed RTP header including an update code indicating one or more fields whose values are being changed by the compressed RTP header, and the change (delta) in those value(s). As disclosed, the fields whose values change include at a minimum an M field and a time click (relative value reflecting an absolute timestamp), and may also include a UDP checksum, IP packet ID, CSRC list and RTP header extension. However, in no event do the fields associated with any group identifier themselves change, similar to amended independent Claim 1.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 1, and by dependency Claims 5-7 and 29, is patentably distinct from Hansen and Chuah, taken individually or in any proper combination. Applicants also respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 8, 15 and 22 recite subject matter similar to that of amended independent Claim 1, including the aforementioned replacing one or more fields associated with the group header identifier with one or more alternative fields. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 8, 15 and 22, and by dependency Claims 12-14, 19-21, 26-28 and 30-32, are also patentably distinct from and Chuah, taken individually or in any proper combination, for at least the same reasons given above with respect to amended independent Claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 19, 21, 22, 25, 26 and 28-31 as being unpatentable over

Hansen in view of Chuah is overcome (or rendered moot by virtue of the cancellation of Claims 4, 11, 18 and 25).

B. Claims 6, 13, 20 and 27 are Patentable

The Official Action rejects Claims 6, 13, 20 and 27 as being unpatentable over Hansen in view of Chuah, and further in view of Chapman. As explained above, amended independent Claims 1, 8, 15 and 22, and by dependency Claims 5-7, 12-14, 19-21 and 26-32, are patentably distinct from Hansen and Chuah, taken individually or in any proper combination. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that Chapman does not cure the defects of Hansen and Chuah. That is, even considering Chapman, none of Hansen, Chuah or Chapman, taken individually or in any proper combination, teaches or suggests the aforementioned replacing one or more fields associated with the group header identifier with one or more alternative fields. Thus, for at least the foregoing given above with respect to amended independent Claims 1, 8, 15 and 22, and by dependency Claims 5-7, 12-14, 19-21 and 26-32 are also patentably distinct from Hansen, Chuah and Chapman, taken individually or in any proper combination.


For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 6, 13, 20 and 27 as being unpatentable over Hansen in view of Chuah, and further in view of Chapman is overcome.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks presented herein, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. As such, the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested. In order to expedite the examination of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in order to resolve any remaining issues.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew T. Spence
Registration No. 45,699

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111
LEGAL02/30880554v1

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON AUGUST 4, 2008.